When to Use Non-Probability

An evaluation of the use of a non-probability mobile panel in a post-disaster area in comparison to a probability sample
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The Health of Houston Survey (HHS) is a comprehensive health survey of City of Houston and Harris County, Texas residents conducted by the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston School of Public Health (UT Health).

Content – The survey collects data on resident health status and chronic conditions, health risk behaviors, psychosocial factors, and neighborhood characteristics.

Study Design
- Targeted 6,500 completed interviews; 60% Cell / 40% Landline split
- Random Digit Dial (RDD); household adult with the nearest birthday; must live in the Greater Houston Area

Data collection began on June 8, 2017 but was suspended on August 27, 2017 when Hurricane Harvey (Pre-Harvey) made landfall.
- ICF completed ~50% of our target interviews
Background – The Challenge

- Although the study was suspended, there was still a need to obtain data from the community to better understand the impact of the hurricane, and provide aid.

- Challenges w/ conducting a probability study post-disaster
  - Increased costs for RDD
    - Reduced landline activity due to infrastructure damage
  - Restricted accessibility for mail survey
  - Population displacement may alter stratification estimates
    - Inability to estimate change to Census/ACS population estimate; also impacts weighting
  - Timeline between set up and administration
Background – Research

- **Why non-probability?**
  - Less expensive
  - Geo-targeting
  - Quick setup
  - Engaged respondent base
  - Ability to establish demographic quotas

- **Why mobile?**
  - Primary source of connectivity to the internet post-disaster (Kaigo, 2012)
  - Optimal communication path for government aid (e.g., assistance registration, news updates) - Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 2013 report

- Mobile, non-probability panels offer an alternative method for collecting post-disaster data
Background – Current Study

- Our study explores the use of a non-probability mobile panel, in comparison to a traditional random digit dial (RDD) study, as a measure of population displacement, and attitudes and health outcomes post-disaster in Harris County, TX.

- Key research questions
  - Can we use a non-probability panel to help assess financial and methodological risks of restarting the probability study?
  - How comparable are the responses from the non-probability panel to the probability study post-Harvey?
  - Can displacement in the non-probability panel be used as a proxy for area displacement post-disaster?
Methodology

▪ Non-probability study
  ▪ Mobile non-probability panel provided by mfour
  ▪ Panelists received the survey via the mfour’s mobile app “Surveys on the Go”.
    ▪ Survey was specific to the impact of Hurricane Harvey (e.g., flooding, damage, mental/physical health)
    ▪ Panelist profiles provide demographic information
      – Survey was ‘pinged’ (using smartphone push notifications) to panelists in the Houston area
      – Data collection started on December 20, 2017 and ended January 2, 2018
      – A total of 503 completed surveys were received

▪ Revised post-Harvey RDD methodology
  ▪ Resumed fielding in February 2018; scheduled to end on April 23rd
  ▪ Methodological revisions
    – Revised Cell / LL proportions, 75% and 25%, respectively
    – Reduced attempts on Cell (8 down to 5) and LL (15 down to 8)
    – Reduced target # of completes to 5,500
    – Incorporated Hurricane Harvey impact items (revised for interviewer administration)
Results – Demographic Comparisons

- Non-probability panel data was compared to unweighted cell probability data from the telephone survey, both pre- and post-Harvey
  - Overall, panelists were more likely to be younger, female, non-Hispanic, with some college education and living with at least one child
  - Non-probability panel more closely matched cell respondents compared to landline respondents
    - Comparisons looked exclusively at cell respondents
Results – Post-Disaster Comparisons

- Non-probability panel data was compared to unweighted probability data from the telephone survey (controlling for demographics had no impact on distributions)

- Panelists were more likely to report flooding and damage to homes and vehicles, respectively.
- Panelists were more likely to have evacuated
- Panelists reported greater psychological distress
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Results

- Displacement Estimates
  - Method
    - RDD – Pre- and Post-Harvey (cell and landline) reported demographics were compared
    - Mobile Panel – Pre- and Post-Harvey panel demographic characteristics were compared
  - Neither the RDD nor mobile panel revealed substantial differences in demographic characteristics
    - Survey result from both the panel and RDD results confirmed there was little long-term displacement
    - We hypothesize short-term displacement would have been detected had the study been fielded within weeks of the disaster.
      - Contracting and study design challenges
    - Future disaster displacement measurement can be detected via time-lapse geo-location tracking of panel members
Conclusions

- Panel demographics skewed younger, more female, less Hispanic, fewer zero children households, and more educated
  - Quotas can address skew, however controlling for demographic differences did not impact our results
- Panel respondents reported greater impact from Hurricane Harvey
  - More exposure to damage, flooding, needing to evacuate, psychological distress
    - Timeline of fielding could have impact on psychological distress results (panel fielded two months earlier)
  - Results suggest more analysis needed, focusing potentially on respondent location in relation to disaster
    - Controlling for sub-geography in addition to demographics
- Demographic characteristics of RDD and Mobile Panel respondents did not vary significantly pre- and post-Harvey.
  - Lack of variation does not discount the functionality of using the mobile panel characteristics to track population displacement.
    - Future research should focus on trying to field earlier
    - Utilize time-lapsed geo-tracking of respondents